

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed December 12, 2007.

I. Summary of Objections and Rejections

Claims 1, 16-25, 27-28, and 33-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rana, et al. ("Java Junction," Intelligent Enterprise, April 16, 2001; referred to below as "Rana") in view of BEA Systems (WebLogic Server 6.1, general availability date August 1, 2001; referred to below as "WebLogic Server 6.1").

Claim 19 was objected to because of an informality.

Claims 27-28 and/or Claims 37-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 29 was listed in the Office Action Summary as rejected, but no rejection to Claim 29 was made in the body of the Office Action (nor was Claim 29 rejected in the First Office Action).

II. Statement of Summary of Examiner Interview of February 14, 2008

Applicants acknowledge with thanks Examiner Cao's assistance in granting an interview on February 14, 2008, during the course of which interview various features of the claimed embodiments were discussed, the substance of which is included herein and is found in the Examiner Interview Summary of February 20, 2008. Applicants' representatives and Examiner Cao discussed the 101 rejection and the 103(a) rejection to Claim 1.

With regards to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection, Examiner Cao clarified that all of the claims had issues under 35 U.S.C. 101, not just claims 27-28 and/or claims 37-38.

With regards to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection, the Examiner clarified why the office action stated that BEA WebLogic Server 6.1 documentation reference, dated September 19, 2001, might qualify as a 35 U.S.C. 102(a) reference that could be combined with Rana to make a 103(a) rejection. Applicants' representatives clarified why it was their position that the reference would not qualify under 102(a). The examiner suggested that a declaration from one of the inventors could resolve the issue and remove the reference.

III. Summary of Applicants' Response

Claims 1, 16-19, 21-25, 27-28, and 33-41 were amended, and claims 20 and 29 were cancelled, leaving for the examiner's consideration claims 1, 16-19, 21-25, 27-28, and 33-41.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

The Office Action alleged that either Claims 27-28 or Claims 37-38 do not satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. In the examiner interview, the examiner clarified that all of the claims had issues with 35 U.S.C. 101.

The preamble of Claim 1 was amended to provide:

A ~~system~~ computer readable storage medium storing instructions for improved implementation of a J2EE connector architecture on an application server, the instructions comprising:

The remaining claims were similarly amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended even further satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to Claims 1, 16-25, 27-29, and 33-41

Claim 1

Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A ~~system~~ computer readable storage medium storing instructions for improved implementation of a J2EE connector architecture on an application server, the instructions comprising:

a resource adapter for an Enterprise Information System;
a set of system-level contracts between the resource adapter and an application server;

a Common Client Interface capable of providing a client API for Java applications and development tools to access the resource adapter;

a connection manager on the application server capable of managing and maintaining size of a pool of connections to the Enterprise Information System, wherein the connection manager matches a request for a new connection to the Enterprise Information System, through the resource adapter, with an existing and available managed connection in the pool of connections, and wherein the connection manager creates a plurality of managed connections when an existing and available managed connection is not found; and

a set of packaging and development interfaces that provide the ability for resource adapters to plug into J2EE applications in a modular manner; and

a deployment descriptor containing a configuration element for the resource adapter, the configuration element allowing a user to override default deployment

values for the resource adapter.

Claim 1 was amended to include features previously found in Claim 29. The features found within claim 29, “a deployment descriptor containing a configuration element for the resource adapter, the configuration element allowing a user to override default deployment values for the resource adapter” were not previously rejected, either in the Office Action mailed December 12, 2007 or in the First Office Action mailed April 10, 2007. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 16-19, 21-25, 27-28, and 33-41

For the reasons stated above, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to Claims 16-25, 27-29, and 33-41 be reconsidered.

VI. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration of the claims is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 12, 2008

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/
Thomas K. Plunkett, Reg. No. 57,253

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910